The Frankfurt School of Social Research and the Origins of the Therapeutic State

A Case Study of Jewish Intellectual Activism

Kevin MacDonald

The purpose of this paper is to describe the origins and influence of the Frankfurt School.[1] The Frankfurt School has gotten a great deal of attention as a key influence in the culture of the West, particularly since the end of World War II. This account differs from most others in emphasizing the ethnic commitments of the key figures in the movement—in particular, that the Frankfurt School is a Jewish intellectual movement.

Such a claim is prone to oversimplification, so I wish to be very clear on what the claim that the Frankfurt School is a Jewish intellectual movement entails. The procedure I have used is as follows:[2]

1. Find influential movements dominated by Jews, with no implication that all or most Jews are involved in these movements and no restrictions on what the movements are. For example, neoconservatism qualifies as a Jewish intellectual movement despite the fact that most American Jews are not neoconservatives.[3] Relatively few Jews have been involved in most Jewish intellectual movements and significant numbers of Jews may have been unaware of their existence. Jewish leftist radicalism—surely the most widespread and influential Jewish subculture of the twentieth century—may have been a minority movement within some Jewish communities in the United States and other Western societies in some periods. And even Zionism, while doubtless a Jewish movement, was not a majority movement in Western Jewish communities at least until after World War II.

2. Determine whether the Jewish participants in those movements identified as Jews *and* thought of their involvement in the movement as advancing specific Jewish interests. Involvement may be unconscious or involve self-deception. If I thought that self-deception was important (as in the case of many Jewish radicals), I provided evidence that in fact they did identify as Jews and were deeply concerned about Jewish issues despite surface appearances to the contrary.[4] In general, finding evidence on the ethnic commitments and motivations of the main proponents of the movements is a straightforward matter of assessing their statements and writings.

3. Try to gauge the influence of these movements on non-Jewish society. In making such claims, it is important to remember that the influence of an intellectual or political movement dominated by Jews is independent of the percentage of the Jewish community that is involved in the movement or supports the movement.

No one should be shocked at the possibility that intellectuals and social scientists pursue their ethnic interests via their research and writing. Indeed, this should be the default assumption. But it must be proved, not assumed.

Research in the ethnic motivations of people is perfectly respectable. No one would be surprised if Mexican activists proudly and explicitly advocated the interests of Mexicans in immigration and affirmative action. Nor are we surprised if Jewish activists promote the interests of Israel. By the same logic, we shouldn't be surprised if Jewish social scientists are motivated by their ethnic interests. It's an empirical question that can be investigated like any other question in the social sciences, and I believe that the data confirm the hypothesis that the Jews who were central to the origins and influence of the Frankfurt School were indeed motivated by their ethnic interests.

The Frankfurt School originated at the Institute of Social Research, affiliated with the University of Frankfurt during the 1920s in Germany. The first generation were all Jews by ethnic background; the Institute of Social Research itself was funded by a Jewish millionaire, Felix Weil.[5] Weil's efforts as a "patron of the left" were extraordinarily successful: By the early 1930s the University of Frankfurt had became a bastion of the academic left and "the place where all the thinking of interest in the area of social theory was concentrated."[6] During this period, sociology was widely referred to as a "Jewish science."[7] With the rise of National Socialism in 1933, the Institute of Social Research was labeled a communist organization and closed because it "encouraged activities hostile to the state."[8] This resulted in the emigration of the main figures to the United States, where they remained until after World War II.

Gershom Scholem, the Israeli theologian and religious historian, termed the Frankfurt School a "Jewish sect," and there is good evidence for a very strong Jewish identification on the part of many members of the school.[9] Max Horkheimer, a director of the Institute, had a strong Jewish identity that became increasingly apparent in his later writings.[10] Horkheimer's commitment to Judaism, as evidenced by the presence of specifically Jewish religious themes, was already apparent in his writings as an adolescent and as a young adult.[11] By the end of his life Horkheimer had completely accepted his Jewish identification and achieved a grand synthesis between Judaism and Critical Theory.[12] (Critical Theory is the name applied to the theoretical perspective of the Frankfurt School.) According to Horkheimer, the goal of philosophy must be to vindicate Jewish history: "The anonymous martyrs of the concentration camps are the symbols of humanity that is striving to be born. The task of

philosophy is to translate what they have done into language that will be heard, even though their finite voices have been silenced by tyranny."[13]

Horkheimer's inspiration derived from his attempt to leave behind religious Judaism while nevertheless retaining a sense of Jewish identification. Not surprisingly, there is alienation and estrangement from German culture and from the German language, which he sees as stemming from a "strange mentality":

> Had I just arrived from my homeland of Palestine, and in an amazingly short time mastered the rudiments of writing in German, this essay could not have been more difficult to write. The style here does not bear the mark of a facile genius. I tried to communicate with the help of what I read and heard, subconsciously assembling fragments of a language that springs from a strange mentality. What else can a stranger do? But my strong will prevailed because my message deserves to be said regardless of its stylistic shortcomings.[14]

T. W. Adorno, another director of the Institute, was ethnically half Jewish, the son of a wealthy Jewish wine merchant and an Italian Catholic mother. From 1940 on Jewish themes became increasingly prominent in Adorno's writings. The Holocaust is the focus of much of Adorno's later work, most famously his statement that "to write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric,"[15] and his question as to "whether after Auschwitz you can go on living—especially whether one who escaped by accident, one who by rights should have been killed, may go on living."[16] The historian Zoltan Tar concludes that for Adorno, "no study of sociology could be possible without reflecting on Auschwitz and without concerning oneself with preventing new Auschwitzes."[17] "The experience of Auschwitz was turned into an absolute historical and sociological category."[18]

Such comments indicate an intense Jewish consciousness and commitment to Judaism. They also show that the research and philosophy of the Frankfurt School was no ordinary scientific project, but rather one with a predetermined ethnic agenda.

The Frankfurt School intellectuals also illustrate the theme of cultural critique which has been a common posture of Jewish intellectuals since the Enlightenment.[19] As John Murray Cuddihy observed, with the entry of Jews into the mainstream of Western culture,

> Jewry—like some wide-eyed anthropologist—enters upon a strange world…They examine this world in dismay, with wonder, anger, and punitive objectivity. This wonder, this anger, and the vindictive objectivity of the marginal nonmember are recidivist; they continue unabated into our own time because Jewish Emancipation continues into our own time.[20]

The entry of Jews into the mainstream of Western culture resulted in a "culture of critique" in which Jews have formed an elite hostile to the traditional

peoples and culture of Europe.[21] To date, the most murderous effects of Jews becoming a hostile elite were played out in the Soviet Union, where Jews participated in the destruction of the traditional culture of Russia and became the willing executioners of millions of Soviet citizens.[22]

As described below, the writings of the Frankfurt School called into question all of the sources of cohesion of Western societies: family, religion, culture, and race/ethnicity. Horkheimer was quite conscious of the relationship between Jewish assimilation and cultural criticism: "Assimilation and criticism are but two moments in the same process of emancipation."[23]

A consistent theme of Horkheimer and Adorno's Critical Theory was the transformation of Western society according to a morality which safeguarded the existence and prosperity of Judaism. From the beginning there was a rejection of value-free social science research ("the fetishism of facts") in favor of the fundamental priority of a moral perspective in which present societies, including capitalist, fascist, and eventually Stalinist societies, were to be transformed into utopias of cultural pluralism.

The Frankfurt School never set out to find out the truth about human behavior and institutions. Instead, its members viewed empirically oriented social science as an aspect of domination and oppression. Horkheimer wrote in 1937 that "if science as a whole follows the lead of empiricism and the intellect renounces its insistent and confident probing of the tangled brush of observations in order to unearth more about the world than even our well-meaning daily press, it will be participating passively in the maintenance of universal injustice."[24] Rather than find out how society works, the social scientist must be a critic of culture and adopt an attitude of resistance toward contemporary societies.

The unscientific nature of the enterprise can also be seen in its handling of dissent within the ranks of the Institute—a trend that is a common feature of Jewish intellectual and political movements.[25] Erich Fromm was excised from the movement in the 1930s because his leftist humanism opposed the authoritarian nature of the psychoanalyst-patient relationship. This was not compatible with the pro-Bolshevik stance championed at the time by the Horkheimer-Adorno line: Fromm "takes the easy way out with the concept of authority, without which, after all, neither Lenin's avant-garde nor dictatorship can be conceived of. I would strongly advise him to read Lenin…I must tell you that I see a real threat in this article to the line which the journal takes."[26] Similarly, Herbert Marcuse was excluded when his orthodox Marxist views began to diverge from the evolving ideology of Adorno and Horkheimer.[27]

Throughout its history, to be a member of the Institute was to adopt a certain view and to submit to heavy editing and even censorship of one's works to ensure conformity to a clearly articulated ideological position. Writing approvingly of Walter Benjamin's work, Adorno stated, "I have come to be convinced that his work will contain *nothing* which could not be defended from the point

of view of dialectical materialism."[28] Whatever else one might say of such a statement, it does not illustrate the spirit of scientific inquiry.

The priority of the moral and political agenda of Critical Theory is essential to understanding the Frankfurt School and its influence. Horkheimer and Adorno eventually rejected the classical Marxist perspective on the importance of class struggle for the development of fascism, and went on to develop the view that both fascism and capitalism involved domination and authoritarianism. And they claimed to find the roots of domination and authoritarianism in disturbed parent-child relations.

This focus on disturbed parent-child relations led them to psychoanalytic theory—that other highly subversive and influential twentieth century Jewish intellectual movement.[29] Virtually from the beginning, psychoanalysis had a respected position within the Institute for Social Research, particularly under the influence of Erich Fromm. Fromm held positions at the Frankfurt Psychoanalytic Institute as well as at the Institute for Social Research, and along with other "left-Freudians" such as Wilhelm Reich and eventually Marcuse, he developed theories that incorporated both Marxism and psychoanalysis.

The basic tactic was to take advantage of the fact that normal family life requires the suppression of unbridled sexuality. That is, successful family life is built on sexual restraint and the attitude that the care and nurturing of children is an important goal. The Frankfurt School theorists then imagined that the sexual restraint demanded by effective families resulted in various pathologies, including capitalist oppression. Obviously, this was a tactic that was apparent in psychoanalysis from the beginning. Since psychoanalysis, like the Frankfurt School, was really nothing more than a hermeneutic (i.e., interpretive) structure masquerading as a science, it is not surprising that it could be easily molded by the Frankfurt School theorists to achieve their political aims.

A good example illustrating the style of the Frankfurt School and its Jewish commitments is a chapter on anti-Semitism in Horkheimer and Adorno's *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, originally published in 1944. The general thesis is that the Enlightenment resulted in Europeans dominating nature via the rise of science, technology, and industry. However, this was accomplished by suppressing human nature by means of pathological family relationships. The end result of the Enlightenment was therefore fascism, because fascism is the ultimate form of domination and of the use of science as an instrument of oppression—a fanciful result to say the least.[30]

Dialectic of Enlightenment uses the same general logic for building its ideology of anti-Semitism. Statements on the origins of anti-Jewish attitudes and behavior are simply asserted, with no attempt at proof. However, it is interesting that many of the ideas that *Dialectic of Enlightenment* advances in no more than a philosophical, speculative manner are identical to the theories of anti-Semitism that later became enshrined in *The Authoritarian Personality*. Indeed, the authors viewed *The Dialectic of Enlightenment's* chapter on anti-

Semitism as a theoretical basis for the empirical study of anti-Semitism in *The Authoritarian Personality*.[31] *The Authoritarian Personality* may thus be viewed as an attempt to provide these philosophical theories of anti-Semitism with empirical support. But the theory itself was fundamentally an *a priori* one in the philosophical sense: It was not viewed by its authors as subject to either verification or falsification.[32]

Dialectic of Enlightenment is a mishmash of psychoanalysis (repressions, transferences, and projections resulting in violence against Jews) and Marxism (evil ruling elites manipulating the mob to mask their domination).[33] For example, the ideology that Jews possess negative traits is simply a projection resulting in a self-portrait of the anti-Semite: Anti-Semites accuse the Jews of wanting power, but in reality the anti-Semites "long for total possession and unlimited power, at any price. They transfer their guilt for this to the Jews" (p. 169). Anti-Semitism also results from the "urge to destroy" carried out by "covetous mobs" that are ultimately manipulated by ruling elites to conceal their own economic domination. Anti-Semitism is without function except to serve as a means of discharging the anger of those who are frustrated economically and sexually (p. 171).

Not surprisingly, Christianity and fascism—two prime bogeymen of Jewish intellectuals—both result in opposition to and subjugation of nature, while Judaism is described as a "natural religion" concerned with national life and self-preservation. In an argument reminiscent of Freud's argument in *Moses and Monotheism*, religious anti-Semitism then arises because of hatred of those "who did not make the dull sacrifice of reason… The adherents of the religion of the Father are hated by those who support the religion of the Son—hated as those who know better" (p. 179).

This psychoanalytic interpretation of anti-Semitism as fundamentally deriving from suppressing nature is central to the main works of the Frankfurt School directed at English-speaking audiences—the Studies in Prejudice series, and particularly *The Authoritarian Personality*.

The theme that all modern ills, including National Socialism, collectivism, adolescent rebellion, mental illness, and criminality are due to the suppression of nature, including human nature, is also prominent in Horkheimer's *Eclipse of Reason*: Each human being experiences the domineering aspect of civilization from his birth. To the child, the father's power seems overwhelming, supernatural in the literal sense of the word. The father's command is reason exempt from nature, an inexorable spiritual force. The child suffers in submitting to this force. It is almost impossible for an adult to remember all the pangs he experienced as a child in heeding innumerable parental admonitions not to stick his tongue out, not to mimic others, not to be untidy or forget to wash behind his ears. In these demands, the child is confronted by the fundamental postulates of civilization. He is forced to resist the immediate pressure of his urges, to differentiate between himself and the environment,

to be efficient—in short, to borrow Freud's terminology, to adopt a superego embodying all the so-called principles that his father and other father-like figures hold up to him.[34]

Suppression of nature results in projection of qualities of self onto the environment, and, particularly, onto the Jews. "Impulses which the subject will not admit as his own even though they are most assuredly so, are attributed to the object—the prospective victim" (p. 187). So, for example, a non-Jew is aggressive but he won't admit this to himself and instead finds this quality in Jews. Psychoanalytic theory is used to explain this process by arguing that the aggression actually originates from suppressed hatred for the father—exactly the theory utilized in *The Authoritarian Personality*. Aggressive urges originating in the id are projected onto the external world by actions of the superego. But it gets even stranger: "The forbidden action which is converted into aggression is generally homosexual in nature. Through fear of castration, obedience to the father is taken to the extreme of an anticipation of castration in conscious emotional approximation to the nature of a small girl, and actual hatred to the father is suppressed" (p. 192).

So what anti-Semites are really afraid of is being castrated by their fathers for wanting to engage in homosexual behavior. (Not even Freud came up with this one.) Emotionally, anti-Semites are little children forced to obey their fathers, resulting in intense aggressive feelings directed at Jews. At the same time that he is behaving aggressively toward Jews, the anti-Semite projects his own aggressiveness onto the Jews, so that it is the Jews who are described as aggressive, not himself.

One struggles to find words to adequately express the ridiculousness of this analyses. And when one realizes that the authors are two of the towering intellectuals of the twentieth century, one can only marvel at the sheer power of the Jewish intellectual infrastructure that was able to provide this sort of thinking with the veneer of legitimacy and intellectual sophistication. As discussed below, the writings of the Frankfurt School did not occur in a vacuum. They were the result of ethnic networking in the media, book publishing, and the academic world.

Another theme is conformity, viewed as morally suspect because Germans became conformists to the culture of National Socialism. The intellectuals of the Frankfurt School suppose that people by nature are nonconformist, but this natural, nonconforming, reflective self has been corrupted by capitalism or fascism. The development of large industrial interests and the culture industry of late capitalism have destroyed in most people the inner-directed, reflective power that can produce "self-comprehending guilt" (p. 198), which could oppose the forces leading to anti-Semitism..

Thus humans are portrayed as naturally opposed to conformity. As described below, a consistent theme of *The Authoritarian Personality* is that participation in anti-Jewish groups with high levels of social conformity is a

sign of pathology. Similar behavior of Jews in conformity to the group discipline typical of Judaism throughout its history is ignored.

In fact, as we have seen, Judaism is portrayed in *The Dialectic of Enlightenment* as morally superior to Christianity. And it is this superiority that becomes yet another cause of anti-Semitism. Judaism is described as

> Happiness without power, wages without work, a home without frontiers, religion without myth. These characteristics are hated by the rulers because the ruled secretly long to possess them. The rulers are only safe as long as the people they rule turn their longed-for goals into hated forms of evil (p. 199).

The conclusion is that if the rulers in fact allowed the ruled to be like the Jews, there would be a fundamental turning point of history. The end of anti-Semitism becomes a precondition for the development of a utopian society and the liberation of humanity—perhaps the closest that the Frankfurt School ever came to defining utopia. The envisioned utopian society is one in which Judaism can continue as a cohesive group but in which cohesive, nationalistic groups of non-Jewish Europeans are banned in the interests of achieving mental hygiene. Thus we see the origins of the therapeutic state in the West.

This strand of theory is actually an early form of multiculturalism, in which the continued existence of Jews in a climate of tolerance has become a criterion of the moral worth of a society. According to this view, the unique role of Judaism in world history is to vindicate the concept of diversity against the homogenizing forces thought to represent the essence of Western civilization.[35] Judaism thus represents the antithesis of Western universalism. The continuation and acceptance of Jewish particularism becomes a precondition for the development of a utopian society of the future.

Within this perspective, the roots of anti-Semitism are therefore to be sought in individual psychopathology, not in the behavior of Jews. An important theme of Studies in Prejudice and, especially, *The Authoritarian Personality* is that the group affiliations of non-Jews, and particularly Christianity, ethnic nationalism, and even close family relationships, are an indication of psychiatric disorder.

At a deep level the work of the Frankfurt School is addressed to altering Western societies in an attempt to make them resistant to anti-Semitism by pathologizing the group affiliations of non-Jews. As discussed below, these affiliations include family, nation, religion, and race. Because these group affiliations are prime mechanisms of ethnic defense, undermining these affiliations has the effect of rendering Western peoples defenseless against replacement by other peoples.

Such radical critiques by Jewish intellectuals of the group affiliations of non-Jews have a long history. During the period of the Spanish Inquisition, Jews who had nominally converted to Christianity were vastly overrepresented among the humanist thinkers of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain. These

thinkers opposed the cohesive, homogeneous nature of Spanish society centered around the Christian religion.[36]

In Germany, anti-Jewish commentators (e.g., Paul de Lagarde) throughout the nineteenth century into the 1920s complained that Jews advocated political forms such as liberalism, which opposed structuring society as a highly cohesive group. At the same time they themselves retained an extraordinary group cohesiveness that enabled them to dominate Germans.[37] For example, in *Mein Kampf*, Hitler recorded his belief that Jewish advocacy of liberal attitudes was a deception overlaying a commitment to racialism and a highly cohesive group strategy: "While he [the Jew] seems to overflow with 'enlightenment,' 'progress,' 'freedom,' 'humanity,' etc., he himself practices the severest segregation of his race" (p. 315). A common component of anti-Semitism among academics during the Weimar period was a perception that Jewish contributions to culture were frequently attempts to undermine patriotic commitment and social cohesion through withering criticism of traditional values.[38]

In fact, such critiques have been a hallmark of Jewish intellectual movements in the twentieth century. For example, Freud identified as a Jew and supported Jewish causes such as Zionism while at the same time developing a theory of Christianity as fulfilling infantile needs. The noted anthropologist Franz Boas identified strongly as a Jew and opposed anti-Semitism while developing a theory that undercut the common belief of Europeans of his day that they were members of a race with extraordinary accomplishments. The radical leftist political movements typical of so many Jewish communities in Europe and throughout the Western world in the twentieth century simultaneously undermined the traditional group affiliations of non-Jews, such as Christianity and nationalism, while at the same time they allowed for the continuation of Jewish identification. For example, Jewish communists consistently opposed Polish nationalist aspirations. When they came to power after World War II, they liquidated Polish nationalists and oppressed the Catholic Church. At the same time, they established secular Jewish economic and social institutions.[39]

This theme is highly compatible with the Frankfurt School's consistent rejection of European nationalism.[40] Thus the ideology of the Frankfurt School prescribes radical individualism for non-Jews—an individualism that rejects strong group affiliations for non-Jews in the interests of mental hygiene. For example, in Horkheimer's essay on German Jews, the true enemy of the Jews is any cohesive grouping of non-Jews, and especially nationalism.[41] Although no mention is made of the collectivist nature of Judaism, Zionism, or Israeli nationalism, the collectivist tendencies of modern European society are deplored. Horkheimer's prescription for non-Jews is radical individualism and the acceptance of pluralism and diversity. People have an inherent right to be different from others and to be accepted by others as different. Indeed, to become differentiated from others is to achieve the highest level of humanity. As Adorno noted, the only criterion for a better society was that it be one in

which "one can be different without fear" (p. 131).[42] The former communist had become an advocate of radical individualism, at least for non-Jews.

Another facet of this intellectual onslaught was the adoption of radical philosophical skepticism. This skepticism doubted any attempt to understand the nature of reality. (Obviously, this is completely at odds with the "truths" that were supposedly discovered by his social science research embodied in *The Authoritarian Personality*.) Given Adorno's preoccupation with Jewish issues and his strong Jewish identity, one can only conclude that this ideology was intended to justify Jewish particularism. In this view, Judaism, like any other historically particular entity, must remain beyond the reach of science. Judaism is forever incomprehensible in its uniqueness and ever in opposition to all attempts to develop homogeneous social structures in the society as a whole. However, its continued existence is guaranteed as an *a priori* moral imperative.

The prescription that European societies adopt radical individualism fits well with Jewish interests. Individualists do not identify with ingroups (such as their race) and are less likely to hold negative attitudes toward outgroups (such as Jews).[43] Individualists would also be more likely to blame offensive Jewish behavior as resulting from transgressions by individual Jews rather than from attitudes and behavior common among Jews or the organized Jewish community. Jews, however, as members of a collectivist subculture living in an individualistic society, are themselves more likely to develop negative stereotypes of non-Jews.

And, in fact, European societies have historically been much more committed to individualism—a phenomenon that I have explained as resulting from our evolutionary past.[44] This means that Europeans are less likely to have negative attitudes toward outgroups. Judaism, on the other hand, is the opposite: It is a highly collectivist subculture in which authoritarianism and obedience to ingroup norms and the suppression of individual interests for the common good have been of vital importance throughout its history.[45] This implies that the Frankfurt School intellectuals advocated a highly individualist, atomized culture for non-Jews while simultaneously maintaining their own ethnic identity. This is the fundamental contradiction in the writings of the Frankfurt School and is apparent throughout Studies in Prejudice.

The Authoritarian Personality thus seeks to convince its readers that non-Jews who identify with family, nation, or race suffer from a psychiatric disorder. As the historian and social critic Christopher Lasch noted, "The purpose and design of Studies in Prejudice dictated the conclusion that prejudice, a psychological disorder rooted in 'authoritarian' personality structure, could be eradicated only by subjecting the American people to what amounted to collective psychotherapy—by treating them as inmates of an insane asylum."[46] From the beginning, this was social science with a political agenda: "By identifying the 'liberal personality' as the antithesis of the authoritarian personality, they

equated mental health with an approved political position. They defended liberalism…on the grounds that other positions had their roots in personal pathology."[47]

In the ideal Frankfurt School world, Western nations would become therapeutic states. They would be dedicated to rooting out the remnants of adherence to traditional cultural forms of family, nation, religion, and race in their non-Jewish citizens. And they would so in the interests of promoting mental health.

Dissecting *The Authoritarian Personality*

The principal intellectual difficulty with *The Authoritarian Personality* is that it sees the group loyalty so central to Judaism as a successful group evolutionary strategy as pathological in non-Jews. Non-Jews who even think of Jews as a distinctive group or category are suspect. For example, one of the items on the Anti-Semitism Scale, claimed to measure anti-Jewish attitudes, is "The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere." But, as social psychologist Roger Brown comments, "How could it be otherwise? Surely Jews will produce a Jewish atmosphere. They will at any rate do so if one thinks of Jews as 'categorically different from non-Jews.' However, it is just this saliency of 'Jewishness' which the authors consider the beginning of anti-Semitism."[48] The implicit assumption is that non-Jews who think of Jews as a distinctive category are on the road to anti-Semitism. Nevertheless, among Jews, the Jew/non-Jew social category is critical for Jewish identification. The implication is that strong ingroup loyalty, or even categorizing people in ingroups and outgroups, should be reserved for Jews and is dangerous in others.

Similarly ironic as an aspect of the Anti-Semitism Scale is the inclusion of the items "I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew" and "It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry." The attitudes of non-Jews who agree with these statements are said to result from disturbed parent-child relationships and the suppression of human nature. Yet the rejection of intermarriage has been common among Jews. In fact, the "threat" of intermarriage has recently produced a crisis within the Jewish community and has resulted in intensive efforts to persuade Jews to marry other Jews.[49]

Some items on the Anti-Semitism Scale simply reflect actual Jewish characteristics. For example, several are concerned with perceptions of Jewish clannishness and its effect on residential patterns and business practices. Others deal with perceptions that Jews engage in cultural separatism and that Jews have power, money, and influence out of proportion to their numbers in the population. One item reflects the overrepresentation of Jews in leftist and radical political causes: "There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the Jewish make-up as shown by the fact that there are so many Jewish Communists

and agitators." In fact there is considerable truth in these generalizations, especially during the 1940s, when the association of Jews with radicalism was quite strong.[50] Having a high score on the Anti-Semitism Scale was probably more an indication of one's knowledge and forthrightness about the Jewish community than a sign of a disordered childhood.

Also interesting is the Patriotism Scale, designed to tap attitudes involving "blind attachment to certain national cultural values, uncritical conformity with the prevailing group ways, and rejection of other nations as outgroups" (p. 107). Strong attachment to group interests by the majority group is considered pathology, whereas no mention is made of analogous group attachments by Jews. Anti-Semites are said to want power for their own groups and to value clannishness in them while condemning similar Jewish behavior.[51] No mention is made of Jews, including the Frankfurt School intellectuals, who are clannish and strongly identify with their ingroup while condemning the ethnocentrism of others.

At the heart of *The Authoritarian Personality* is the finding that non-Jews who have close family ties are prone to ethnocentrism. "Ethnocentrists tend to be submissive to ingroup authority, anti-ethnocentrists to be critical and rebellious…The family is the first and prototypic ingroup."[52] Thus strong family ties themselves stem from psychopathology. This is an incredible proposition on the face of it, since it not only flies in the face of common sense, but also contradicts the findings of a massive amount of research in psychology.

The logic is as follows. The reader is asked to consider a two-generation situation in which the first generation tends to be relatively high on ethnocentrism and political conservatism; that is, they identify with their ethnic group and its economic and political interests. Prediction of whether children will similarly identify with their ethnic group and its interests depends on whether children rebel against their parents. The conclusion of this syllogism, given the values implicit in the study, is that rebelling against parental values is psychologically healthy because it results in lower ethnocentrism scores. Conversely, lack of rebellion against the parent is implicitly viewed as pathological. These ideas are expanded in later sections of *The Authoritarian Personality* and constitute a central aspect of the entire project.

Again the double standard is glaringly obvious. The transmission of Judaism over the generations has required that children accept parental values. Rebellion against parents and the complete abandonment of all ingroup designations would mean the end of Judaism, but it is the epitome of mental health for non-Jews.

It's the same with religious affiliation. Commitment to Christianity was found to be linked to ethnocentrism. On the other hand, individuals who rebelled against their parents and adopted another religion, or no religion, were lower on ethnocentrism. The Christian religion is associated with "conformity, conventionalism, authoritarian submission, determination by external

pressures, thinking in ingroup-outgroup terms and the like vs. nonconformity, independence, internalization of values, and so forth" (p. 220). Individuals identifying strongly with the religion of the majority are viewed as suffering from psychopathology. Yet Judaism as a viable religion would necessarily be associated with these same psychological processes.

In fact, *The Authoritarian Personality* shows quite clearly that people who score high on the Ethnocentrism Scale tend to come from very functional, adaptive, competent, and concerned families. These individuals identify with their families as an ingroup. As adults, they want to have families like the ones they grew up in. Low scorers, on the other hand, have ambivalent, rebellious relationships with their families. They often express a sense of abandonment and lack of affection toward their families, and they do not identify with their family as an ingroup.

This actually makes sense in light of modern research on parenting. Parents who have close relationships with their children and discipline them in a moderate way are more successful in transmitting their cultural values.[53] In reading the interview material, one is struck by the fact that low scorers on the ethnocentrism scale have rather negative views of their parents, whereas high scorers have quite positive views.

But from the standpoint of *The Authoritarian Personality*, the low scorers must be seen as mentally healthy, while the high scorers must be seen as pathological.

The data do show that low scorers are more rebellious against their parents. A big part of the deceptiveness of *The Authoritarian Personality,* however, lies in its interpretation that low scorers' resentment against their parents is a good thing. The meager signs of affection and obvious evidence of resentment on the part of the children of low scorers are interpreted as genuine affection.

On the other hand, the very positive perceptions of their parents held by the high scorers are viewed as the result of extreme parental authoritarianism resulting in repression and denial of parental faults.

These results are an excellent example of the ideological biases inherent in the project. A developmental psychologist looking at these data is impressed by the fact that the parents of the high scorers manage to inculcate a very positive perception of family life in their children while managing to discipline them nonetheless. This type of parent is termed an authoritative parent by developmental psychologists. Children from such families have close relationships with their parents, and they accept parental values and group identifications. Thus, if the parents are religious, the child is likely to be religious, too. And if parents hold up education as a value, the children are likely to try their best in school.

The deeply subversive agenda of *The Authoritarian Personality* is to pathologize this type of family among non-Jews. However, since parental affection is viewed positively according to the theory, evidence for parental affection

among the high scorers must be interpreted as a mask for parental hostility; and the low scorers must be interpreted as having affectionate parents despite surface appearances to the contrary. Rebellion against parents by the low scorers is then interpreted as the normal outcome of affectionate child rearing—a ridiculous view at best.

Fundamentally, then, the political agenda of *The Authoritarian Personality* is to undercut the family relationships of non-Jews. But the ultimate aim is to subvert the entire social categorization scheme underlying the culture of the West. Some families are highly cohesive, and children within these families have a strong sense of ingroup feeling toward their families. The children also fundamentally accept the values and attitudes of their parents, including church, community, nation, and even race. High-scoring subjects are proud of their families, their accomplishments, and their traditions.

These positive attitudes toward church, community, nation, and race, however, tend to result in negative attitudes toward people from different religions, communities, nations, and races. It is this type of family that *The Authoritarian Personality* condemns as pathological. With typical rhetorical chutzpah, expressions of family pride are described as "a setting off of a homogeneous totalitarian family against the rest of the world."[54]

Once again, the question of double standards arises. This is exactly the type of family necessary for the continuation of a strong sense of Jewish identity: Jewish children must accept the basic values of their parents. They must view their families as ingroups and ultimately accept the ingroup represented by Judaism. Again, the fundamental intellectual difficulty that runs throughout the entire book is that its agenda must inevitably pathologize in non-Jews what is critical to the maintenance of Judaism.

A good example of this is that high scorers feel a sense of obligation and duty toward their parents. But in the upside-down world of *The Authoritarian Personality*, a woman who intends to marry someone approved by her parents and who takes account of the views of her parents in dating is viewed as having a psychiatric disorder. Families that are proud of their ancestors, concerned with moving up socially, or even having biological heirs are viewed as pathological. Children who are popular in school and are high achievers, children who have high self-esteem and are attractive to the opposite sex, children who are sexually confident, desirous of high-quality mates, and with high moral standards regarding sexuality are seen as products of a pathological environment. [55]

In fact, one might conclude that the real agenda of *The Authoritarian Personality* is to pathologize adaptive behavior in general. Non-Jews who value highly committed marriages and cohesive families, who are upwardly mobile and seek material resources, who are proud of their families and identify with their parents, who have high self-concepts, who believe that Christianity is a positive moral force (p. 408) and a spiritual consolation (p. 450), who strongly

identify as males or females (but not both!), and who are socially successful and wish to emulate paragons of social success (e.g., American heroes) are viewed as having a psychiatric disorder.

On the other hand, non-Jews who are socially isolated, who have negative and rebellious attitudes toward their families, who are ambivalent and insecure in their sexual identities, who have low self-esteem and are filled with debilitating insecurities and conflicts (including insecurities about whether their parents loved them), who are moving downward in social status, and who have negative attitudes toward high social status and acquisition of material resources are viewed as the epitome of psychological health.

It is highly ironic that a publication written by Jewish intellectuals and published by the American Jewish Committee would classify a concern for social status and material resources, competent and concerned parenting, identification with one's parents, and pride in one's family as signs of psychiatric disorder in non-Jews, given the extent to which all these attributes characterize Jews. All of these characteristics are critical to the success of Judaism as a group evolutionary strategy. Jewish parents have always socialized their children to identify with their ethnic group. And they have intensely pressured their children toward upward mobility and wealth. In fact, "Success is so vitally important to the Jewish family ethos that we can hardly overemphasize it…We cannot hope to understand the Jewish family without understanding the place that success for men (and recently women) plays in the system."[56]

Conclusion
The Authoritarian Personality as Intellectual Deception

The authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* subverted the culture of the West by claiming that non-Jews and their culture—and especially the most successful and culturally approved members of their society—were victims of a psychiatric disorder.

Psychoanalysis was obviously an ideal vehicle for creating this upside-down world. Psychoanalysis essentially allowed the authors to make up any story they wanted. If the family relationships of high scorers on the ethnocentrism scale were very positive on the surface, they interpreted the surface happiness and affection as masking deep, unconscious hostilities. Any shred of negative feeling high scorers felt toward their parents then became a lever to be used to create an imaginary world of suppressed hostility masked by surface affection. Yet when another volume of Studies in Prejudice found that anti-Semites had poor relationships with their parents, the results were taken at face value.[57] The result was not science, but it was effective propaganda.

All five volumes of the Studies in Prejudice series used psychoanalysis to produce theories in which anti-Semitism was attributed to intrapsychic conflict, sexual repression, and troubled parent-child relationships. Needless to say, there

is no mention that anti-Semitism might be fueled by actual Jewish behavior. Psychoanalytic interpretations of anti-Semitism continue to appear[58]—showing once again that psychoanalysis has been a key Jewish intellectual movement for advancing Jewish interests.[59]

The bottom line is that high scorers on the ethnocentrism scale accept the values of their parents. But this does not explain the origins of parental values themselves. The reality is that competent families are good at transmitting parental values between generations, even if those values include negative attitudes toward other groups. This shouldn't be surprising. But since the Frankfurt School intellectuals deplored the fact that competent families sometimes had ethnocentric children who disliked Jews, they were forced to find that, despite surface appearances to the contrary, the competent families themselves were really quite pathological.

On the other hand, *The Authoritarian Personality* is quite positive about individuals who were completely detached from all ingroups, including the family. As with political radicalism, only a rarified cultural elite could attain the extremely high level of mental health epitomized by the genuine liberal:

> The replacement of moral and political argument by reckless psychologizing not only enabled Adorno and his collaborators to dismiss unacceptable political opinions on medical grounds; it led them to set up an impossible standard of political health—one that only members of a self-constituted cultural vanguard could consistently meet. In order to establish their emotional "autonomy," the subjects of their research had to hold the right opinions and also to hold them deeply and spontaneously.[60]

The ideology that ethnocentrism was a form of psychopathology was promulgated by members of a group that over its long history had arguably been the most ethnocentric group among all the cultures of the world. Nonetheless, the promulgators of this ideology, all strongly identifying as Jews, never challenged, or even discussed, the legitimacy of the Jewish people to maintain a group identity and to strive for political, economic, and cultural power. The failure of non-Jews, however, to adopt these beliefs was viewed as an admission of personal inadequacy and an acknowledgment that such non-Jews suffered from a condition that would benefit from psychiatric counseling.

It is not difficult to suppose that the entire research program of *The Authoritarian Personality* involved deception from beginning to end. This is suggested by the authors' clear political agenda and by the pervasive double standard whereby ethnocentrism and involvement in cohesive groups are seen, for non-Jews, as symptoms of psychopathology, whereas Jews are simply viewed as victims of the irrational pathologies of non-Jews and consideration of Jewish ethnocentrism or allegiance to their own group is simply omitted.

There was also a double standard by which left-wing authoritarianism was completely ignored, whereas right-wing authoritarianism was "determined" to be a psychiatric disorder. Deception is also suggested by the fact that the basic theory of the role of parent-child relations in producing ethnocentrism and hostility toward outgroups was developed as a philosophical theory rather than as a scientific theory that could be verified or falsified. The entire thrust of the Frankfurt School's view of science was to reject the idea that science should attempt to understand reality in favor of the ideology that science ought to serve moral (i.e., political) interests.[61]

Deception is also suggested by the fact that the anti-democratic leanings of Adorno and Horkheimer and their radical critique of the mass culture of capitalism disappeared when they wrote for an American academic audience. Horkheimer portrayed Critical Theory as a form of radicalism to his "Marxist friends," while representing it "as a form of faithfulness to the European tradition in the humanities and philosophy" when discussing it with "official university people."[62]

Finally, there are a host of well-recognized methodological difficulties in *The Authoritarian Personality,* including the use of unrepresentative subjects in the interview data, the very incomplete and misleading information on the reliability of the measures, and the discussion of insignificant relationships as if they were significant.[63] One might also point to the extremely strained, ad hoc, and counterintuitive interpretations of how family relationships relate to ethnocentrism.[64] In this endeavor, it should be no surprise that psychoanalysis—another hugely influential Jewish intellectual movement—was quite useful in producing any desired interpretive outcome.

Of course, deception may also have been accompanied by self-deception—a common enough feature of Jewish intellectual history.[65] In any case, the result was excellent political propaganda and a potent weapon in the war on anti-Semitism.

The Influence of the Frankfurt School: Institutionalizing the Ideology of the Therapeutic State

Although it is difficult to assess the effect of works like *The Authoritarian Personality* on the culture of the West, there can be little question that the thrust of this work, as well as of other works inspired by psychoanalysis and its derivatives, was to pathologize adaptive behavior in general. Good parenting, upward social mobility, and pride in family, religion, nation, and race are all suspect. Many of the central attitudes of the 1960s countercultural revolution find expression in *The Authoritarian Personality,* including idealizing rebellion against parents, uncommitted sexual relationships, and scorn for upward social mobility, social status, family pride, Christianity, and patriotism.

Despite this antagonistic perspective on the mores of the West, Jewish 1960s radicals continued to identify with their parents and with Judaism. The

countercultural revolution was in a very deep sense a mission to non-Jews, in which their adaptive behavior and group identifications were pathologized while Jewish group identification, ingroup pride, family pride, upward social mobility, and group continuity retained their psychological importance and moral legitimacy.

Viewed at its most abstract level, a fundamental agenda has been to influence European peoples to view concern about their own demographic and cultural eclipse as irrational and as an indication of psychopathology. People who do not identify with the basic social categories of family, religion, nation, or race will be unconcerned about the demise of these things.

The success of the Frankfurt School stemmed from what one might term the Jewish intellectual and activist infrastructure of the post–World War II era. Despite its scientific weakness, the ideology that anti-Jewish attitudes resulted from disturbed parent-child relationships has been promulgated by the most prestigious institutions of the society, and especially by elite universities and the mainstream media, as the essence of scientific objectivity. The moral and intellectual elite that grew up around these movements dominated intellectual discourse during a critical period after World War II, helping to foster the countercultural revolution of the 1960s. As a result, college students during this period were powerfully socialized to adopt liberal-radical cultural and political beliefs. Its effects continue into the present.

As reviewed in the following, postwar Jewish intellectual infrastructure produced a great many other works that reinforced the basic ideas found in *The Authoritarian Personality* and other works of the Frankfurt School. This general intellectual onslaught is important because it produced a zeitgeist that was far more effective than one or two works by isolated authors.

Similarly, neoconservatism has been championed by a well-defined group of mainly Jewish authors with shared assumptions, a common institutional base in the universities and think tanks, access to the major media, and mutual admiration.[66] The power of the movement comes not from the work of a few individuals but from its dissemination in the media, its legitimacy in the universities, its promotion by Jewish activist organizations, and its constant repetition in slightly different forms and for different audiences by like-minded intellectuals and writers.

Table 1 lists characteristics of Jewish intellectual movements that are critical to their influence. Among Jewish intellectual and political movements that show these characteristics are Boasian anthropology, Jewish involvement in political radicalism, psychoanalysis, the Frankfurt School, the New York Intellectuals, and neoconservatism.[67] The only characteristic in Table 1 which does not clearly apply to the Frankfurt School is that there were no important non-Jews in highly visible positions in the movement until the emergence of second-generation Frankfurt intellectuals such as Jürgen Habermas.[68]

TABLE 1: CHARACTERISTICS OF JEWISH INTELLECTUAL MOVEMENTS

- A deep concern pervades the movement with furthering specific Jewish interests such as undermining the ethnic identities of non-Jews (Frankfurt School, psychoanalysis, Marxism, Boasian anthropology), helping Israel (neoconservatism), or promoting immigration (all Jewish intellectual movements found among the organized Jewish community during the twentieth century);
- Issues are framed in a rhetoric of universalism rather than as satisfying Jewish interests;
- Issues are framed in moral terms, and an attitude of moral superiority pervades the movement;
- The movement is centered around charismatic leaders (Horkheimer, Trotsky, Freud);
- Jews form a cohesive, mutually reinforcing core;
- Non-Jews appear in highly visible roles, often as spokespersons for the movement;
- A pronounced ingroup/outgroup atmosphere prevails within the movement—dissenters are portrayed as the personification of evil and are expunged from the movement;
- The movement is irrational in the sense that it is fundamentally concerned with using available intellectual resources to advance a political cause;
- The movement is associated with the most prestigious academic institutions in the society;
- Access is given to prestigious and mainstream media sources, partly as a result of Jewish influence on the media;
- Active involvement is exercised by the wider Jewish community in supporting the movement.

The Frankfurt School was a critical part of the intellectual justification for what participants termed the "intergroup relations movement" that worked to "eliminate prejudice and discrimination against racial, ethnic, and religious minorities" in the period following World War II.[69] As with the other movements with strong Jewish involvement, Jewish organizations, in particular the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League, were the leaders. These organizations provided the major sources of funding, devised the tactics, and defined the objectives of the movement.

As was also the case with the movement to open up the United States to immigration from all areas of the world, its conscious aim was to prevent the development of a mass anti-Jewish movement in the United States: Jewish activists "saw their commitment to the intergroup relations movement as a preventive measure designed to make sure 'it'—the Nazis' war of extermination against European Jewry—never happened in America."[70] A consistent theme emphasized the benefits to be gained by increased levels of intergroup

harmony. But there was no mention that some groups, particularly European-derived, non-Jewish groups, would in consequence lose economic and political power and decline in cultural influence.[71]

The success of this movement has led to a huge increase in Jewish power and influence, and a concomitant decrease in the political and cultural power of European-derived peoples—ethnic competition by any other name.

The intergroup relations movement was a multifaceted effort, including

- Legal challenges to bias in housing, education, and public employment;
- Legislative proposals and efforts to secure their passage into law in state and national legislative bodies;
- Efforts to shape messages in the media;
- Educational programs for students and teachers;
- Intellectual efforts to reshape academic discourse, especially on issues related to race and ethnicity.

Based on the writings of the Frankfurt School, the intergroup relations movement disseminated the ideology that ethnocentrism and discrimination against outgroups was a mental disease, and thus literally a public health problem. The assault on negative attitudes toward other groups was likened to the medical assault on deadly infectious diseases. People with the disease were described by activists as "infected,"[72] and the more serious cases of anti-Semitism were described as "virulent." Negative attitudes toward groups were viewed not as the result of competing group interests but rather as the result of individual psychopathology.[73]

While the ethnocentrism and ingroup loyalty of non-Jews was viewed as a public health problem, these same Jewish activist organizations actively fought against Jewish assimilation. For example, the American Jewish Congress "was explicitly committed to a pluralistic vision that respected group rights and group distinctiveness as a fundamental civil liberty."[74]

The Frankfurt School ideology, with its heavy reliance on psychoanalysis and Marxism, was not the only intellectual movement that inspired the intergroup relations movement. The other major intellectual pillar was provided by Boasian anthropology—also a Jewish intellectual movement.[75] Boasian anthropology was enlisted in post–World War II propaganda efforts distributed and promoted by the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League. An influential example is the animated film *Brotherhood of Man*, which depicted all human groups as having equal abilities. During the 1930s the American Jewish Committee financially supported Boas in his research; in the postwar era, the Boasian ideology that there were no racial differences as well as the Boasian ideology of cultural relativism and the importance of preserving and respecting cultural differ-

ences have been important ingredients of educational programs sponsored by these Jewish activist organizations and widely distributed throughout the American educational system.[76]

By the early 1960s an ADL official estimated that one-third of America's teachers had received ADL educational material based on these ideas.[77] The ADL was also involved in staffing, developing materials, and providing financial assistance for workshops for teachers and school administrators, often with the involvement of social scientists from the academic world—an association that undoubtedly added to the scientific credibility of these exercises. It is ironic, perhaps, that this effort to influence the public school curriculum was carried on by the same groups that were endeavoring to remove overt Christian influences from the public schools.[78]

Part of the success of the intergroup relations movement was the involvement of activist Jewish academics who continued to refine the ideology of the Frankfurt School. A good example is *The Politics of Unreason* (1970). This volume was part of the Patterns of American Prejudice series, funded by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and written by Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab. (Raab and Lipset also wrote *Prejudice and Society*, published by the ADL in 1959.)

It is of interest that the Studies in Prejudice series, which included *The Authoritarian Personality,* was funded by the American Jewish Committee. Obviously there is a link between academic research on ethnic relations and Jewish activist organizations like the AJC and the ADL. For example, Raab's career has combined academic scholarship with deep involvement as a Jewish ethnic activist. Raab is associated with the ADL and is executive director emeritus of the Perlmutter Institute for Jewish Advocacy at Brandeis University. He is also a columnist for the San Francisco *Jewish Bulletin*.

The Politics of Unreason analyzes political and ideological expressions of ethnocentrism by European-derived peoples as irrational and to be distinguished from legitimate ethnic interests in retaining political power. Movements aimed at retaining or restoring the power of the European-derived majority of the United States are labeled "right-wing extremism." Their politics is "the politics of despair."[79] For Lipset and Raab, tolerance of cultural and ethnic pluralism is a defining feature of democracy, so that groups that oppose cultural and ethnic pluralism are by definition extremist and anti-democratic.

The Politics of Unreason may therefore be seen as an argument that the European peoples in the United States and other areas of the Western world should not resist declines in their cultural and demographic dominance. (Analogous arguments rarely seem to surface among Jews contemplating whether Israel should remain a Jewish state.) Attempts by majorities to resist the increase in the power and influence of other groups are contrary to "the fixed spiritual center of the democratic political process" (p. 5). "Extremism *is*

anti-pluralism…And the operational heart of extremism is the repression of difference and dissent."[80]

"Right-wing extremism" is also condemned because of its populist tendencies—its distrust of institutions that intervene between the people and their direct exercise of power. Indeed, in the post–World War II era *The Authoritarian Personality* was an important ideological weapon against historical American populist movements, especially McCarthyism.[81] "[T]he people as a whole had little understanding of liberal democracy and …important questions of public policy would be decided by educated elites, not submitted to popular vote."[82]

Seen in this light, democracy does not reside in the power of the people to pursue their perceived interests. Rather, government is to be the province of morally and intellectually superior elites; and, in an Orwellian turn, democracy is defined as guaranteeing that majorities will not resist the expansion of power of minorities, even if that means a decline in their own power.

Harvard historian Richard Hofstadter was another anti-populist Jewish intellectual influenced by the Frankfurt School. Hofstadter developed the "consensus" approach to history, characterized by historian Walter T. K. Nugent as "a querulous view of popular movements, which seem to threaten the leadership of an urbanized, often academic, intelligentsia or elite, and the use of concepts that originated in the behavioral sciences."[83] As we have seen, "sciences" is too strong a word in this context.

Hofstadter used Adorno's concept of the "pseudo-conservative" to condemn departures from liberal orthodoxy in terms of the psychopathology of "status anxiety." In terms derived from the *Authoritarian Personality* studies, Hofstadter diagnosed pseudo-conservatism as "among other things a disorder in relation to authority, characterized by an inability to find other modes for human relationship than those of more or less complete domination or submission."[84] As Nugent points out, this perspective largely ignored the "concrete economic and political reality involved in populism and therefore left it to be viewed fundamentally in terms of the psychopathological and irrational."[85] This is precisely the method of *The Authoritarian Personality*: Real conflicts of interest between ethnic groups are ignored. Ethnic animosities held by the majority are simply the irrational projections of inadequate personalities.

As can be seen from these examples, much of the writing of Hofstadter, Lipset, and a host of other Jewish intellectuals influenced by the Frankfurt School focused on attacking American populism. Important contributors to this intellectual zeitgeist included prominent historians such as Hofstadter, Oscar Handlin, and Max Lerner, as well as prominent sociologists like Lipset and Raab, Daniel Bell, David Riesman, Nathan Glazer, and Edward A. Shils.[86] A common theme was what Nugent terms "undue stress" on the image of the populist as an anti-Semite—an image that exaggerated and oversimplified the

American Populist movement; however, it had the intended effect of tarring the movement as morally repugnant.[87]

But of course there were real conflicts of interest. On one side were Jewish intellectuals advancing their interests as an urbanized intellectual elite bent on ending the demographic and cultural predominance of European-derived people in the United States. Manning the front lines on the other side were what historian John Higham terms "the common people of the South and West," who were battling to maintain their own cultural and demographic dominance.[88] This struggle continues to be played out in many arenas: immigration policy, literature, art, and music, the public role of Christianity, and civil rights legislation.

As the vanguard of an urbanized Jewish elite, this group of intellectuals was contemptuous of the lower middle class generally. A good example is *Escape from Freedom* (1941), written by Erich Fromm, who had been a member of the Frankfurt School until he was expelled for intellectual deviancy. Fromm, who had a very strong Jewish identity,[89] regarded the lower middle class as prone to developing "sado-masochistic" reaction formations as a response to their economic and social status frustrations. This resulted in them joining authoritarian groups—prototypically the National Socialists in Germany. Their desire for upward social mobility and their fear of downward social mobility are not interpreted as normal human aspirations—common enough in Jews and non-Jews alike. Rather, they are signs of a specific psychiatric disorder—pathetic results of inappropriate socialization that would disappear in the liberalized utopian society of the future.

The results were very influential: "A whole generation of college-educated Americans was deeply influenced by Erich Fromm's argument, in *Escape From Freedom*, that National Socialism was the natural outcome of the interplay between a Protestant sensibility and the contradictions inherent in capitalism."[90] Fromm essentially viewed authoritarianism as resulting from an unconscious fear of freedom. Because of their fear of freedom, people sought out fascist movements. Thus, once again anti-Semitism is seen to result from psychopathology.

Like Adorno, Fromm advocated the view that psychological health was epitomized by individualists rather than by people who identified strongly with their race or religion: "Progress for democracy lies in enhancing the actual freedom, initiative, and spontaneity of the individual, not only in certain private and spiritual matters, but above all in the activity fundamental to every man's existence, his work."[91]

As noted above, a good strategy for Jews is to advocate radical individualism among non-Jews. The irony (hypocrisy?) is that Fromm and the other members of the Frankfurt School strongly identified with their own ethnic group and worked hard to advance Jewish interests while nevertheless advocating radical individualism for the society as a whole.

Another major Frankfurt School figure was Herbert Marcuse. Marcuse, who became a countercultural guru of the 1960s, was a member of the first generation of the Frankfurt School. In *Eros and Civilization* (1974), Marcuse accepts Freud's theory that Western culture produces pathology because it represses sexual urges. He pays homage to Freud, who "recognized the work of repression in the highest values of Western civilization—which presuppose and perpetuate unfreedom and suffering."[92] Marcuse cites Wilhelm Reich's early work approvingly as an exemplar of the "leftist" wing of Freud's legacy. Reich—of orgone energy and the "science" of orgonomy fame—"emphasized the extent to which sexual repression is enforced by the interests of domination and exploitation, and the extent to which these interests are in turn reinforced and reproduced by sexual repression."[93] Like Freud, Marcuse points the way to a nonexploitative utopian civilization of the future that would result from the complete end of sexual repression. But Marcuse goes beyond Freud's ideas in his even greater optimism about the beneficial effects of ending sexual repression.

Although Critical Theory ceased to be a guide for protest movements by the early 1970s,[94] it has retained a very large influence in the intellectual world generally. In the contemporary intellectual world, there are several journals devoted to this legacy, including *New German Critique*, *Cultural Critique*, and *Theory, Culture, and Society: Explorations in Critical Social Science*.

Contemporary postmodernism and multiculturalist ideology have also adopted several central pillars of the Frankfurt School: the fundamental priority of ethics and values in approaching education and the social sciences; empirical science as oppressive and an aspect of social domination; a rejection of the possibility of shared values or any sense of either universalism or national culture; and a "hermeneutics of suspicion" in which any attempt to construct such universals or a national culture is energetically resisted and "deconstructed."[95]

Postmodernism implicitly accepts a Balkanized model of society in which minority groups and their interests have *a priori* moral value, while cohesive groups formed by non-Jewish majorities are viewed as pathological and subject to radical criticism.

If there was one central message to the Frankfurt School, this is it. Needless to say, it is a message that reverberates powerfully in the present.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W. (1967). *Prisms*, trans. Samuel and Shierry Weber. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Adorno, T. W. (1969). Scientific experiences of a European scholar in America. In *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960*, eds. D. Fleming & B. Bailyn. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Adorno, T. W. (1973). *Negative Dialectics*, trans. E. B. Ashton. New York: Seabury Press.

Adorno, T. W. (1974). *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*, trans. E. F. N. Jephcott. London: Verson Editions. (Originally published in 1951.)

Adorno, T. W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, & R. N. Sanford. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. Publication No. 3 of the American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Bettelheim, B., & M. Janowitz. (1950). *Dynamics of Prejudice: A Psychological and Sociological Study of Veterans*. Publication No. 4 of the American Jewish Committee Social Studies Series. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Brown, R. (1965). *Social Psychology*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Carlebach, J. (1978). *Karl Marx and the Radical Critique of Judaism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Cuddihy, J. M. (1974). *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Levi-Strauss, and the Jewish Struggle with Modernity*. New York: Basic Books.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*. New York: Rinehart.

Glazer, N., & D. P. Moynihan. (1970). *Beyond the Melting Pot*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Gless, D. J., & B. Herrnstein Smith, eds. (1992). *The Politics of Liberal Education*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gottfried, P. (1998). *After Liberalism: Mass Democracy in the Managerial State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. J. J. Shapiro. Boston: Beacon Press. (German ed. copyright 1968.)

Herz, F. M., & E.J. Rosen. (1982). Jewish families. In *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*, eds. M. McGoldrick, J. K. Pearce, & J. Giordano. New York: The Guilford Press.

Higham, J. (1984). *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, rev. ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Originally published in 1975.)

Hofstadter, R. (1965). *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays*. New York: Knopf.

Horkheimer, M. (1947). *The Eclipse of Reason*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Horkheimer, M. (1974). *Critique of Instrumental Reason*, trans. M. J. O'Connell and others. New York: Seabury Press.

Horkheimer, M., & T. W. Adorno. (1990). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, trans. J. Cumming. New York: Continuum. (Originally published as *Dialektik der Aufklärung* in 1944.)

Horowitz, D. (1997). *Radical Son: A Journey through Our Time*. New York: Free Press.

Jay, M. (1973). *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Jay, M. (1980). The Jews and the Frankfurt School: Critical theory's analysis of anti-Semitism. *New German Critique* 19:137–149.

Lasch, C. (1991). *The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Liebman, C. (1973). *The Ambivalent American Jew: Politics, Religion, and Family in*

American Jewish Life. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
Lipset, S. M., & E. Raab. (1970). *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790–1970.* New York: Harper & Row.
Lowenstein, S. M. (1983). Jewish residential concentration in post-emancipation Germany. *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 28:471–495.
MacDonald, K. B. (1988). *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis.* New York: Plenum.
MacDonald, K. B. (1992). Warmth as a developmental construct: An evolutionary analysis. *Child Development* 63:753–773.
MacDonald, K. B. (1997). The coherence of individual development: An evolutionary perspective on children's internalization of parental values. In *Parenting and Children's Internalization of Values: A Handbook of Contemporary Theory*, eds. J. Grusec & L. Kuczynski. New York: Wiley.
MacDonald, K. B. (1998/2002). *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements.* Westport, CT: Praeger; paperback version: Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse, 2002.
MacDonald, K. B. (1998/2004). *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism.* Paperback edition of the 1998 Praeger edition, with a new preface. Bloomington, IN: 1stbooks Library.
MacDonald, K. B. (2002). What makes Western culture unique? *The Occidental Quarterly* 2(2):8–38.
MacDonald, K. B. (2004). *Understanding Jewish Influence: A Study in Ethnic Activism*. Augusta, GA: Washington Summit Press.
MacDonald, K. B. (2005). Stalin's willing executioners: Jews as a hostile elite in the USSR. Review of Yuri Slezkine's *The Jewish Century.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. *The Occidental Quarterly* 5(3):65–100.
Maier, J. B. (1984). Contribution to a critique of Critical Theory. In *Foundations of the Frankfurt School of Social Research*, eds. J. Marcus & Z. Tar. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
Marcus, J., & Z. Tar. (1986). The Judaic elements in the teachings of the Frankfurt School. *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 21:339–353.
Marcuse, H. (1974). *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud.* Boston: Beacon Press. (First published in 1955.)
Mayer, E. (1979). *From Suburb to Shtetl: The Jews of Boro Park*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Nugent, W. T. K. (1963). *The Tolerant Populists: Kansas Populism and Nativism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ostow, M. (1995). *Myth and Madness: The Psychodynamics of Anti-Semitism.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
Piccone, P. (1993). Introduction. In *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*, eds. A. Arato & E. Gebhardt. New York: Continuum.
Popper, K. R. (1984). Reason or revolution? In *Foundations of the Frankfurt School of Social Research*, eds. J. Marcus & Z. Tar. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
Ringer, F. K. (1983). Inflation, antisemitism and the German academic community

of the Weimar period. *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook,* 28:3–9.
Rothman, S., & S. R. Lichter. (1982). *Roots of Radicalism: Jews, Christians, and the New Left*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Slezkine, Y. (2004). *The Jewish Century.* NJ: Princeton University Press.
Stern, F. (1961). *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Svonkin, S. (1997). *Jews against Prejudice: American Jews and the Fight for Civil Liberties.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Tar, Z. (1977). *The Frankfurt School: The Critical Theories of Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Wiggershaus, R. (1994). *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance*, trans. M. Robertson. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Endnotes

1. Based on MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 5.
2. MacDonald, 1998/2002.
3. MacDonald, 2004, ch. 3.
4. See MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 3. David Horowitz's (1997) *Radical Son* is a treasure trove of self-deception among Jewish radicals.
5. Wiggershaus 1994, 13.
6. Wiggershaus 1994, 112.
7. Wiggershaus 1994, 112–113.
8. In Wiggershaus 1994, 128.
9. Marcus & Tar 1986, 344.
10. Tar 1977, 6; Jay 1980.
11. Maier 1984, 51.
12. Carlebach 1978, 254–257.
13. Horkheimer 1947, 161.
14. Horkheimer, *My Political Confession*; in Tar 1977, 60.
15. Adorno 1967, 34.
16. Adorno 1973, 363.
17. Tar, 1977, 158.
18. Tar 1977, 165.
19. Cuddihy, 1974; MacDonald, 1998/2002.
20. Cuddihy 1974, 68.
21. MacDonald, 1998/2002.
22. Slezkine, 2004; MacDonald, 2005.
23. Horkheimer 1974, 108.
24. In Wiggershaus 1994, 184.
25. MacDonald, 1998/2004, ch. 6.
26. Adorno, in Wiggershaus 1994, 266.
27. Wiggershaus 1994, 391–392.

28. In Wiggershaus 1994, 161; italics in text.

29. MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 4.

30. See MacDonald, 2002. As Charles Liebman (1973, 157) points out, it was the Jews who "sought the options of the Enlightenment but rejected its consequences," by (in my terms) retaining a strong sense of group identity in a society nominally committed to individualism. In *The Culture of Critique* (MacDonald 1998/2004, chs. 3–5) I argued that Judaism as a highly salient and successful group evolutionary strategy was a necessary condition for the development of prominent Western examples of collectivism.

31. Wiggershaus 1994, 324.

32. Wiggershaus 1994, 320; see also Jay 1973, 240, 251; see also Adorno: "[W]e never regarded the theory simply as a set of hypotheses but as in some sense standing on its own feet, and therefore did not intend to prove or disprove the theory through our findings but only to derive from it concrete questions for investigation, which must then be judged on their own merit and demonstrate certain prevalent socio-psychological structures" (Adorno 1969, 363).

33. Adorno's philosophical style is virtually impenetrable. See Karl Popper's (1984) humorous (and valid) dissection of the vacuity and pretentiousness of Adorno's language. Piccone (1993) proposes that Adorno's difficult prose was necessary to camouflage his revolutionary intent.

34. Horkheimer 1947, 109–110.

35. Jay 1980, 148.

36. MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 1.

37. See Stern 1961, 60, 65.

38. Ringer 1983, 7.

39. MacDonald, 1998/2002, chs. 2, 3 and 4.

40. Tar 1977, 20.

41. Horkheimer 1974.

42. Adorno, 1974, 17.

43. Triandis, 1995.

44. MacDonald 2002.

45. *PTSDA*, chs. 6, 8.

46. Lasch, 1991, 445ff.

47. Lasch 1991, 453.

48. Brown 1965, 483.

49. See MacDonald 1998/2004, ch. 8.

50. Clannishness: Mayer (1979, 84) notes that Orthodox Jews are highly concerned about living in an area which has a sufficiently high concentration of Jews. Lowenstein (1983) shows that Jews continued to live in concentrated areas in Germany after emancipation. See also Glazer and Moynihan (1970) for similar data for American Jews.

Wealth and political influence: MacDonald, 2004.

Political radicalism: MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 3. Rothman & Lichter, 1982.

See also the discussion in MacDonald (1998/2004, ch. 6) of ADL strategies to combat anti-Semitism by making true statements about Jews into exemplars of anti-Semitic attitudes.

51. Adorno et al. 1950, 97.

52. Adorno et al. 1950, 192.
53. E.g., MacDonald 1988a, 1992, 1997.
54. Adorno et al. 1950, 356.
55. See MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 5.
56. Herz & Rosen 1982, 368.
57. Bettelheim, B. & M. Janowitz, 1950.
58. E.g., Ostow 1995.
59. See MacDonald, 1998/2002, ch. 4.
60. Lasch 1991, 453–455.
61. Jay 1973, 248.
62. Wiggershaus 1994, 252
63. Altemeyer 1981.
64. See also Lasch 1991, 453.
65. See MacDonald 1998/2004, chs. 7, 8.
66. MacDonald, 2004.
67. MacDonald 1998/2002; MacDonald 2004, ch. 3.
68. E.g., Habermas 1971.
69. See Svonkin (1997, 1) for an account of the Jewish role in the intergroup relations movement.
70. Svonkin 1997, 10.
71. Svonkin 1997, 5.
72. Svonkin 1997, 30, 59.
73. Svonkin 1997, 75.
74. Svonkin 1997, 81.
75. See MacDonald 1998/2002, ch. 2 for an account of Boasian anthropology as a Jewish intellectual movement.
76. Svonkin 1997, 63, 64.
77. Svonkin 1997, 69.
78. The ADL continues to be a major promoter of diversity education through its A World of Difference Institute (www.adl.org, June, 1998). Since 1985 this institute has trained more than 230,000 elementary and secondary school teachers in diversity education and conducted workplace diversity training programs for workers and college students in the United States. Teacher training programs have also been instituted in Germany and Russia.
79. Lipset & Raab 1970, 3.
80. Ibid., p. 6; italics in text.
81. Gottfried 1998; Lasch 1991, 455ff.
82. Lasch 1991, 455.
83. Nugent 1963, 22.
84. Hofstadter 1965, 58
85. Nugent, 1963, 26.
86. Lasch 1991; Nugent, 1963, 77ff.
87. Nugent 1963, 15.
88. Higham 1984, 49.

89. Marcus & Tar 1986, 348–350; Wiggershaus 1994, 52ff.
90. Rothman & Lichter 1982, 87.
91. Fromm 1941, 272.
92. Marcuse 1974, 240.
93. Marcuse 1974, 239.
94. Wiggershaus 1994, 656.
95. Gless & Herrnstein Smith 1992.